

DOCKET NO. 2002.04.001.WS0
U.S. SERIAL NO. 10/066,248
PATENT

REMARKS

Claims 21-40 are pending in the application.

Claims 21-40 have been rejected.

Claims 21, 25, 28, 31, 34 and 36 have been amended as set forth herein.

Claims 21-40 remain pending in this application.

Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

In Section 1 of the March 19, 2007 Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 21-22 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,167,270 to *Rezaiifar, et al.*, (the "Rezaiifar reference"), in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0048266 to *Choi, et al.*, (the "Choi reference"). Applicant respectfully disagrees and respectfully traverses the Examiner arguments in support of the rejection.

The Rezaiifar reference, either alone or in any combination with the Choi reference, fails to teach or disclose, a handoff required message containing *supplemental channel configuration information about said supplemental channel* being used by said mobile station, wherein the supplemental channel configuration information comprises information on a *supplemental channel burst duration*, as currently required by Claim 21 and its dependent Claim 22.

Moreover, there is no suggestion or motivation within either of the cited references to prompt one of ordinary skill to selectively combine discrete elements from each and then *seek out* still others, as currently required by Claim 21 and its dependent Claim 22. Similar arguments hold true for Claim 28.

LA\SAMS01\00191

-11-

DOCKET NO. 2002.04.001.WS0
U.S. SERIAL NO. 10/066,248
PATENT

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests favourable reconsideration and withdrawal of the §103 rejection.

In Section 2 of the March 19, 2007 Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 23 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Rezaiifar reference in view of Choi reference, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0141370 to *Abrol, et al.* (the "Abrol reference"). Applicant respectfully disagrees and respectfully traverses the Examiner's arguments in support of the rejection.

Claims 23 and 29 depend from allowable Claims 21 and 28, respectively, and are therefore also allowable as shown above. In addition, the Rezaiifar reference, either alone or in any combination with the Choi reference and the Abrol reference, fails to teach or disclose, a handoff required message containing *supplemental channel configuration information about said supplemental channel* being used by said mobile station, wherein the supplemental channel configuration information comprises information on a *supplemental channel burst duration*, as currently required by Claim 21 and its dependent, Claim 23.

Moreover, there is no suggestion or motivation within any of the cited references to prompt one of ordinary skill to selectively combine discrete elements from each and then *seek out* still others, as currently required by Claim 21 and its dependent, Claim 23. Similar arguments hold true for Claim 29.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests favourable reconsideration and withdrawal of the §103 rejection.

DOCKET No. 2002.04.001.WS0
U.S. SERIAL No. 10/066,248
PATENT

In Section 3 of the March 19, 2007 Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 24, 25, and 30-33 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Rezaiifar reference in view of the Choi reference, as applied to Claims 22 and 28 and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0147020 to *Iguchi, et al.*, (the "Iguchi reference"). Applicant respectfully disagrees and respectfully traverses the Examiner's arguments in support of the rejection.

Claims 24 and 25 depend from allowable Claim 21 and are therefore also allowable as shown above. Similarly, Claims 30-33 depend from allowable Claim 31 and are therefore also allowable as shown above. In addition, the Rezaiifar reference, either alone or in any combination with the Choi reference and the Iguchi reference, fails to teach or disclose, a handoff required message containing *supplemental channel configuration information about said supplemental channel* being used by said mobile station, wherein the supplemental channel configuration information comprises information on a *supplemental channel burst duration*, as currently required by Claim 21 and its dependents, Claims 24 and 25.

Moreover, there is no suggestion or motivation within any of the cited references to prompt one of ordinary skill to selectively combine discrete elements from each and then *seek out* still others, as currently required by Claim 21 and its dependents, Claims 24 and 25. Similar arguments hold true for Claims 30-33.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests favourable reconsideration and withdrawal of the §103 rejection.

DOCKET NO. 2002.04.001.WS0
U.S. SERIAL NO. 10/066,248
PATENT

In Section 4 of the March 19, 2007 Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claim 26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Rezaiifar reference in view of the Choi reference and the Iguchi reference as applied to Claim 24 above, and in further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,947,398 to *Ahmed, et al.*, (the "Ahmed reference"). Applicant respectfully disagrees and respectfully traverses the Examiner's arguments in support of the rejection.

Claim 26 depends from allowable Claim 21 and is therefore also allowable as shown above. In addition, the Rezaiifar reference, either alone or in any combination with the Choi reference, the Iguchi reference and the Ahmed reference, fails to teach or disclose, a handoff required message containing *supplemental channel configuration information about said supplemental channel* being used by said mobile station, wherein the supplemental channel configuration information comprises information on a *supplemental channel burst duration*, as currently required by Claim 21 and its dependents, Claim 26.

Moreover, there is no suggestion or motivation within any of the cited references to prompt one of ordinary skill to selectively combine discrete elements from each and then *seek out* still others, as currently required by Claim 21 and its dependent, Claim 26.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests favourable reconsideration and withdrawal of the §103 rejection.

In Section 5 of the March 19, 2007 Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claim 27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Rezaiifar reference in view of the Choi reference, the Iguchi reference and the Ahmed reference as applied to Claim 26 above, and further in view of U.S.

DOCKET NO. 2002.04.001.WS0
U.S. SERIAL NO. 10/066,248
PATENT

Patent No. 5,329,635 to *Wadin, et al.*, (the "Wadin reference"). Applicant respectfully disagrees and respectfully traverses the Examiner's arguments in support of the rejection.

Claim 27 depends from allowable Claim 21 and is therefore also allowable as shown above. In addition, the Rezaiifar reference, either alone or in any combination with the Choi reference, the Iguchi reference, the Ahmed reference and the Wadin reference, fails to teach or disclose, a handoff required message containing *supplemental channel configuration information about said supplemental channel* being used by said mobile station, wherein the supplemental channel configuration information comprises information on a *supplemental channel burst duration*, as currently required by Claim 21 and its dependent, Claim 27.

Moreover, there is no suggestion or motivation within any of the cited references to prompt one of ordinary skill to selectively combine discrete elements from each and then *seek out* still others, as currently required by Claim 21 and its dependent, Claim 27.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests favourable reconsideration and withdrawal of the §103 rejection.

In Section 6 of the March 19, 2007 Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 34-38 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Rezaiifar reference in view of the Choi reference, the Abrol reference, the Iguchi reference, the Ahmed reference and the Wadin reference. Applicant respectfully disagrees and respectfully traverses the Examiner's arguments in support of the rejection.

DOCKET NO. 2002.04.001.WS0
U.S. SERIAL NO. 10/066,248
PATENT

The Rezaiifar reference, either alone or in any combination with the Choi reference, the Iguchi reference, the Ahmed reference, and the Wadin reference, fails to teach or disclose, a handoff required message containing *supplemental channel configuration information about said supplemental channel* being used by said mobile station, wherein the supplemental channel configuration information comprises information on a *supplemental channel burst duration*, as currently required by Claim 34 and its dependents, Claims 35-38.

Moreover, there is no suggestion or motivation within any of the cited references to prompt one of ordinary skill to selectively combine discrete elements from each and then *seek out* still others, as currently required by Claim 34 and its dependent, Claims 35-38.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests favourable reconsideration and withdrawal of the §103 rejection.

In Section 7 of the March 19, 2007 Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 39-40 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Rezaiifar reference in view of the Choi reference, the Abrol reference, the Iguchi reference, the Ahmed reference and the Wadin reference as applied to Claim 14 above and further in view of the IS-95 CDMA and cdma200 text (the "CDMA reference").

Applicant respectfully disagrees and respectfully traverses the Examiner's arguments in support of the rejection.

The Rezaiifar reference, either alone or in any combination with the Choi reference, the Abrol reference, the Iguchi reference, the Ahmed reference, the Wadin reference, and the CDMA reference, fails to teach or disclose, a handoff required message containing *supplemental channel*

DOCKET NO. 2002.04.001.WS0
U.S. SERIAL NO. 10/066,248
PATENT

configuration information about said supplemental channel being used by said mobile station, wherein the supplemental channel configuration information comprises information on a *supplemental channel burst duration*, as currently required by Claim 34 and its dependents, Claims 39-40.

Moreover, there is no suggestion or motivation within any of the cited references to prompt one of ordinary skill to selectively combine discrete elements from each and then *seek out* still others, as currently required by Claim 34 and its dependents, Claims 39-40.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests favourable reconsideration and withdrawal of the §103 rejection.

DOCKET NO. 2002.04.001.WS0
U.S. SERIAL NO. 10/066,248
PATENT

CONCLUSION

For the reasons given above, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims and that this application be passed to issue. If any outstanding issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of this application, the Applicant respectfully invites the Examiner to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below or at *jmockler@munckbutrus.com*.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees connected with this communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0208.

Respectfully submitted,

MUNCK BUTRUS, P.C.

Date: 19 April 2007

P.O. Drawer 800889
Dallas, Texas 75380
Phone: (972) 628-3600
Fax: (972) 628-3616
E-mail: *jmockler@munckbutrus.com*



John T. Mockler
Registration No. 39,775